

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application, Claims 20-26 are withdrawn from consideration, and Claims 1-19 and 27 are rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **SUMMARY OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW**

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the telephonic interview between the Examiner, Leonid M. Fastovsky, and Applicants' representative, Kelly K. Burris, on March 8, 2006, where the Examiner acknowledged that U.S. 3,851,150 to Von Holzen is no longer relevant to the present application.

As discussed in the telephonic interview, the layer 3 of Von Holzen, which has a varied thickness along the length L of the tube, is not a resistive heating element because the layer 3 is made of a good electrically conductive material, such as silver, copper (see col. 1, lines 58-63). As such, the layer 3 functions to **distribute** the heat generated by the underlying tube, rather than to **generate** the heat. Moreover, the layer 3 is deposited throughout the entire outer surface of the tube and does not include a trace as now defined in the amended claims. Accordingly, Von Holzen is no longer relevant to the pending claims.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-9, 14, 17-19 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (U.S. 2005/0141845) in view of Von Holzen (U.S. 3,851,150). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 14, 17-19 and 27 have been cancelled and thus the rejections thereof are now moot.

Claims 2-8 have been amended to depend on Claim 15. Among other limitations, Claim 15 now requires a resistive circuit pattern defining **a trace** having a length, a thickness, and a spacing, wherein the thickness of the resistive circuit pattern varies **along the length of the trace** of the resistive circuit pattern for a variable watt density.

Mori et al. and Von Holzen cannot render Claim 15 and its dependent claims obvious. As the Outstanding Office Action acknowledged, Mori et al. does not disclose a resistive circuit pattern with a variable spacing, thickness, and/or width along the length of the circuit pattern. Further, Von Holzen is no longer relevant to the pending claims in accordance with the telephonic interview, as previously set forth. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-8 be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (U.S. 2005/0141845) in view of Von Holzen (U.S. 3,851,150), and further in view of Friel (U.S. 4,882,466). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled and thus the rejections thereof are now moot.

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the at least one resistive layer comprises a resistive circuit pattern defining **a trace** having a width and a spacing, wherein the thickness of the resistive circuit pattern varies **across the width of the trace** of the resistive circuit pattern for a variable watt density.

Friel cannot render Claim 10 obvious because Friel changes the power output by changing the width and the spacing, rather than by the **thickness**, as required in Claim 10. Moreover, Von Holzen is no longer relevant to the outstanding claims, and Mori et al. is distinguished for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (U.S. 2005/0141845) in view of Von Holzen (U.S. 3,851,150), and further in view of Juliano et al. (U.S. 5,973,296). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 15 and 16 have been amended to clarify that the resistive circuit pattern defines a **trace** having a length, a thickness, and a spacing, and that the thickness of the resistive circuit pattern varies **along the length of the trace** of the resistive circuit pattern for a variable watt density.

Juliano et al. cannot render Claims 15-16 obvious because Juliano et al. makes no mention of a variable thickness of a resistive circuit pattern. Furthermore, Von Holzen is no longer relevant to the outstanding claims, and Mori et al. is distinguished for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (U.S. 2005/0141845) in view of Von Holzen (U.S. 3,851,150), and further in view of Colbert et al. (U.S. 3,010,850).

Claim 11 has been cancelled and thus the rejection thereof is now moot.

### SPECIFICATION

Paragraph [0044] of the specification has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added and respectfully request that the amended paragraph be entered in the present application.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of objection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7524.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 28 MAR 06

By: Kelly K. Burris

Kelly K. Burris  
Reg. No. 46,361

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
7700 Bonhomme Ave.  
Suite 400  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
(314) 726-7500